UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,807	10/19/2004	Dirk Jeroen Breebaart	NL021156US	6530
	7590 06/02/201 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001			FAULK, DEVONA E	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/02/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/511,807	BREEBAART ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears or	the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT	ION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
	: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the h appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of	of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that	Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorteneset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ed statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance	hereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
<u> </u>	and the date of filing a brief will not be entered become
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but price (a) They raise new issues that would require further considerate (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better for appeal; and/or	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresp	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. Sec	e attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
non-allowable claim(s).	e if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided be. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but befor because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suffic was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	e or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered sient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notion entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcor showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and vertical entered affidavit or other evidence failed to overcor showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and vertical entered affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notion entered affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notion entered because the affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notion entered because the affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notion entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcor showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and vertical entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcor showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and vertical entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcor showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and vertical entered failed to overcor enter	ne <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does	NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/S 13. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. 	SB/08) Paper No(s)
	/Devona E. Faulk/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to claims 13,14 and 29 require further search.

Continuation of 13. Other: Regarding claim 18, the applicant asserts that the prior art fails to disclose "a decorrelator unit for generating from the compositie digital signal a decorrelated version of the compositie digital signal, a matrixing unit for receiving the composite digital signal and the decorrelated version of the composite digital signal and generating thereform a replica of the first and second digital audio signal component". The examiner disagrees and asserts the Baumgarte teaches "a decorrelator unit (401) for generating from the composite digital signal a decorrelated version of the composite digital signal (auditory scene synthesis 704, Figure 7, ¶ 0067, ¶ 0074), a matrixing unit (403) for receiving the composite digital signal and the

decorrelated version of the composite digital signal and generating therefrom a replica of the first and second digital audio signal component (auditory scene synthesis 704, Figure 7, ¶ 0067, ¶ 0074). The examiner maintains that Baumgarter's auditory scene synthesis 704 reads on both the decorrelating unit and the matrixing unit. In 704 the composite signal is decorrelated and matrixed as claimed.